

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-44, 51, 53-70, 73-98, 105, and 107-147 are pending, with claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 14, 21, 23, 30, 34, 36, 37, 51, 57, 63, 64, 69, 73, 77, 84, 86, 91, 105, 112, 113, 122-125, 127, 136, and 138 being independent. Claims 10-19, 21-36, 57-61, 63, 73-82, 84-90, 112-124, 127-133, and 135-147 have been withdrawn. Claims 51, 54, 56, 69, 91, 105, 107, and 108 have been amended. No new subject matter has been added.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 69 is objected to for a grammatical error. This has been corrected. Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim 37 is objected to for omission of a parenthesis. Applicants respectfully submit that the Response to Non-compliant Amendment filed on September 2, 2009, does not include such an omission. Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 REJECTIONS

Claims 91-98, 107, and 109-110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 for being indefinite. Specifically, Claim 91 is rejected for containing the language “some combination of.” Claim 91 has been amended in a manner which renders this rejection moot; applicants respectfully request that it be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 20, 37-41, 51, 53, 54, 64-65, 68-70, 83, 91-95, 105, 107-110, 125-126, and 134 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Arora, U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/00114049, in view of Hazi, U.S. Patent No. 7,356,492.

As regards Claims 1-2, 5-7, 20, 37-41, 64-65, 68-70, 83, 91-95, and 134, the Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1, which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to:

A method, comprising:
receiving metadata associated with a media stream from a remote database; and
in response to said metadata, adjusting masking elements of a display screen.

Independent Claims 6, 37, 64, 69, and 91 recite similar limitations. Claims 2, 5, 7, 20, 38-41, 65, 68, 70, 83, 92-95, and 134 are dependent upon one or another of these independent Claims, and recite further features of the claimed embodiments.

Applicants respectfully contend that Arora fails to teach or suggest a method comprising adjusting masking elements of a display screen, in response to a metadata, as claimed.

Applicants understand Arora to purport to describe an approach for excluding extraneous portions of an analog video stream (Abstract). Specifically, the described approach involves modifying the aspect ratio of the video stream by processing the video stream to remove the black bars sometimes used to present widescreen video content on a 4:3 aspect ratio display (*see, e.g.*, [0010], [0020]). The approach of Arora is thus very

clearly directed towards modifying a video stream.

The rejection, referencing Claim 37, suggests that Arora describes manipulating masking elements. Applicants respectfully disagree. The portion of Arora cited discusses the inclusion of black bars in the video stream to take up extra frame space. Other portions of Arora discuss removal of these black bars, as noted above. Neither discussion involves manipulating masking elements *of a display screen*, as claimed; the “black bars” are incorporated into (and deleted from) the video stream, rather than the display.

The current rejection continues to assert that the black bars of Arora are equivalent to the masking elements of a display screen discussed in the claim. Applicants respectfully disagree. Arora teaches manipulating a *video stream*; this video stream is then displayed. There is no adjustment of the masking elements *of a display screen* occurring in Arora – the display screen is displaying the entire video stream provided by the system of Arora. The current claim requires manipulating elements *of a display screen*. In essence, the current rejection is suggesting that playing a video stream made up of continuous black frames is equivalent to providing instructions to a display screen to utilize masking functionality.

The current rejection further cites to Hazi to teach a database, and the use of a masking module. Applicants note that Hazi has nothing to do with metadata associated with media streams, or with masking elements of a display screen. Hazi describes the

production of print and electronic catalogs, where different users are provided different “views” of the content of the catalogs. The masking module of Hazi, as cited in the current rejection, allows a user access to some executable features, while denying access to others. *Applicants respectfully request that Hazi be withdrawn from consideration.*

As regards Claims 51, 53-54, 105, and 107-110, the Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 51, which recites that an embodiment is directed to:

A method, comprising:
 receiving metadata associated with a video stream from a first database; and
 adjusting the viewable area of a display, with reference to said metadata, in order to accommodate a first and a second element of said video stream,
wherein said first database comprises information associating the first element of the media stream with some combination of aspect ratio, horizontal size, vertical size, resolution, anamorphic compression, and letterboxing.

Independent Claim 105 recites similar limitations. Claims 53-54 and 107-110 are dependent on one or the other of these independent Claims, and recite further features of the claimed embodiments.

Applicants respectfully contend that Arora fails to teach or suggest a method including adjusting the viewable area of a display, as claimed.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to Applicants’ understanding of Arora, above. The rejection suggests that Arora describes adjusting the viewable area of a display, and references a discussion of using black bars to fit widescreen (e.g., 16x9) content into a full-screen (e.g., 4x3) presentation. Applicants respectfully contend that

stripping the black bars out of a video stream is not analogous to adjusting the viewable area of a display. Moreover, Applicants contend that Arora does not teach or suggest adjusting the viewable area of a display, with reference to metadata associated with a video stream received from a first database, as claimed. The video stream discussed in Arora at the cited point simply includes portions which happen to be black bars; no adjustment of the display area is made as a result.

In short, Applicants respectfully contend that choosing to embed (or not embed) black bars into a video stream cannot be equated with adjusting the viewable area of a display. In the case of Arora, those black bars embedded in the video stream *are* displayed; if the viewable area of the display had been adjusted, they would not be.

The current rejection continues to assert that the black bars of Arora are equivalent to the masking elements of a display screen discussed in the claim. Applicants respectfully disagree. Arora teaches manipulating a *video stream*; this video stream is then displayed. There is no adjustment of the masking elements *of a display screen* occurring in Arora – the display screen is displaying the entire video stream provided by the system of Arora. The current claim requires manipulating elements of *a display screen*. In essence, the current rejection is suggesting that playing a video stream made up of continuous black frames is equivalent to providing instructions to a display screen to utilize masking functionality.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Arora fails to anticipate or render

obvious the limitations of the claimed embodiments.

As regards Claims 125-126, the Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 125, which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to:

Apparatus including

means for generating a request, said request indicating a media stream available from a first server;

means for transmitting said request from said first server to a second server; and

means for identifying at least one media stream and at least one set of metadata associated with said request, said metadata including at least one set of aspect ratio information.

Claim 126 is dependent upon claim 125, and recites further features of the claimed embodiments.

Applicants respectfully disagree, and contend that Arora fails to teach or suggest means for generating a request indicating a media stream available from a first server, as claimed.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to Applicants' understanding of Arora, above. Applicants further note that Arora does not teach or suggest requesting media streams available from a server, as claimed. The rejection cites to a portion of Arora, where a discussion of the operation of the MPEG encoder 420 is described. While MPEG encoder 420 is described as being able to store frames of MPEG video data after they have been processed, Applicants do not read this portion of Arora as describing a means for generating a request indicating a media stream available from a server, as claimed.

The current rejection maintains that Arora teaches a means for generating a request, and points to Arora at [0032] for support. As discussed above, Applicants read this section of Arora to discuss a location where processed video data may be stored after processing – “Once encoded, the frames of MPEG video can be stored, such as in storage media 460. . . .” Nothing in this description can be reasonably equated with a means for generating a request for a media stream available from a first server, and a means for identifying at least one media stream and at least one set of metadata associated with said request, as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully contend that Arora fails to anticipate or render obvious the limitations recited in the claimed embodiments.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 1-2, 5-7, 20, 37-41, 51, 53-54, 64-65, 68-70, 83, 91-95, 105, 107-110, 125-126, and 134 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 3-4, 43, 66-67, and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Arora, in view of Hazi, further in view of Sie et al., U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0212731.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 3, which recites that an embodiment is directed to:

A method, including steps of
adjusting an aspect ratio of a display screen in response to input

from a viewer; and
sending the adjusted aspect ratio to a remote database.

Independent Claims 1, 37, 64, and 91 recite similar limitations. Claims 4, 43, 66-67, and 97 are dependent upon one or another of these independent claims, and recite further features of the claimed embodiments.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to the analysis of Arora and Hazi presented above as regards Claim 1. As discussed therein, Applicants respectfully contend that Arora fails to teach or suggest adjusting an aspect ratio of a display screen, as claimed. Sie fails to remedy this defect in Arora, as Sie similarly fails to teach or suggest adjusting an aspect ratio of a display screen, as claimed.

Therefore, Arora, alone or in combination with Sie or Hazi, fails to anticipate or render obvious the limitations of the claimed embodiments. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 3-4, 43, 66-67, and 97 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

KALEIDESCAPE, INC.

Date: June 19, 2009

/Kevin Brown/

Kevin A. Brown
Reg. No. 56,303
IP Counsel, Kaleidescape, Inc.
440 Potrero Ave.
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4117
(650) 625-6391